

VZCZCXYZ0005  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1178/01 3521802  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O 181802Z DEC 09  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0735  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5805  
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE  
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 2984  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 1994  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7201

S E C R E T GENEVA 001178

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/17/2019  
TAGS: [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#) [START](#)  
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA  
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) DEFINITIONS SUBGROUP MEETING, DECEMBER  
3, 2009

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States  
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-093.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: December 3, 2009  
Time: 4:30 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

¶3. (S) During a meeting of the Definitions Subgroup the sides agreed that two definitions should be sent to the Conforming Group and a third may be sent after the Russian side consulted with its experts. The sides discussed the definition of "new type." "Conversion or elimination facility" was left bracketed pending resolution of the definition of launch canisters by that working group. Six other terms were discussed but the Russian side could not agree to them because the terms referenced mobile ICBMs or related items. Lastly, the Russian delegation provided their concept for "non-deployed" and stated that the U.S. proposal for a limit of 150 non-deployed ICBMs and SLBMs was not acceptable. End summary.

¶4. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Forwarded To Conforming; Definition of New Type; Other Definitions Discussed; and Non-Deployed.

-----  
FORWARDED TO CONFORMING

-----  
15. (S) The following terms and definitions were agreed:

- The term "Open Skies Airplane" means an airplane performing an observation flight in accordance with the Open Skies Treaty of March 24, 1992, which is simultaneously used for transporting an inspection team through a point of entry to and/or from the territory of the inspected Party.
- The term "non-deployed SLBM" means an SLBM not contained ((, and not considered to be contained,))1 in a deployed launcher of SLBMs.

-----  
DEFINITION OF NEW TYPE  
-----

16. (S) Mr. Siemon invited the Russian side to present its comments regarding the definition of "new type." Col Kamenskiy stated the Russian side had reviewed the term as it was defined in START and paid special attention to throw-weight. Kamenskiy noted that in START, throw-weight was used as part of the attribution method of counting and there was a special protocol devoted to its calculation. In the START Follow-on (SFO) treaty, throw-weight was not used except in this definition. Therefore, the Russian side proposed deleting this criterion (subparagraph (f)) of the definition. For similar reasons, Kamenskiy also proposed deleting launch-weight criterion (subparagraph (c)).

17. (S) The Russian side proposed that the definition for "new type" be based on the remaining criteria; specifically, the number of stages, propellant type, length and diameter. However, because of the improved methods both in missile design and engineering, Kamenskiy advocated reducing the length criteria from 10 percent to 5 percent and likewise, the diameter criteria from 5 percent to 3 percent. Siemon indicated the Russian proposal had been sent to Washington for review and he expected an answer shortly. Siemon acknowledged that in START launch-weight and throw-weight were used for verification but in SFO they could be considered with respect to transparency.

-----  
OTHER DEFINITIONS DISCUSSED  
-----

18. (S) The following terms and definitions were discussed, but were not resolved:

- "Conversion or Elimination Facility." The U.S. delegation stated that it accepted removing the Russian brackets and the sides agreed with the text in subparagraphs (a) and (b). Siemon stated that the remaining bracketed text addressing launch canisters would be removed once the Conversion and Elimination Working Group resolved this issue.

- "Fixed Structure for Mobile Launchers of ICBMs." The Russian delegation noted that the definition contained the term "re stricted area" which they had not agreed to. They proposed substituting the term "basing area." The Russian delegation also proposed revising the definition to read "unique structure, within a basing area, that is designed to contain mobile launchers of ICBMs." Siemon noted that "designed to contain" was significantly different than "can contain" because the intent of the definition was to capture buildings large enough to contain a mobile launcher of ICBMs. The Russian delegation conceded Siemon's point and agreed to consult on this later.

- "Solid Rocket Motor." The Russian delegation stated that they had not studied the latest revision of the Conversion or Elimination Protocol. However, Kuznetsov said he would check his joint draft text (JDT). If he found an example of a solid rocket motor in un-bracketed text he would send it directly to conforming. Siemon added that the U.S. side had

discussed introducing the term "solid rocket motor casing," which would describe what was left after the propellant had been burned out of the ICBM. The U.S. delegation said it would provide a written proposal.

- "ICBM for Mobile Launchers of ICBMs." The Russian delegation stated that until this term appeared in agreed text in some part of the treaty they could not agree to accept it. Therefore, it stayed bracketed.

- "Relocation." The Russian delegation stated that because the definition included the term "mobile launchers of ICBMs" it could not accept this definition for the reason stated above.

- "Deployment Area" and "Basing Area." Again, the Russian delegation stated that because these terms referred to mobile

launchers of ICBMs they could not agree to them. They reiterated that they would consider replacing "restricted area" with "basing area," but this would require further study by the experts. Siemon agreed.

-----  
NON-DEPLOYED  
-----

¶9. (S) Adm Kuznetsov suggested the group discuss deployed heavy bombers. Siemon replied that the U.S. guidance was to attribute three warheads to each heavy bomber but it did not address the definitions of a deployed nor of a non-deployed heavy bomber. Since this was one of the major issues of the treaty, Siemon recommended deferring such a discussion. Kuznetsov acknowledged Siemon's point but noted that the Russian side had developed a general concept on deployed missiles and their launchers. He noted that "deployed" and "non-deployed SLBMs" terms were agreed text in the SFO treaty.

¶10. (S) Siemon noted that the United States had proposed a limit of 150 non-deployed ICBMs and SLBMs that would become effective 7 years after entry-into-force of the SFO treaty. Kuznetsov noted that this was logical as Russia had many SLBM launchers that required elimination. Siemon noted that the same was true for the U.S. side as there were 50 empty Peacekeeper ICBM silos, 50 empty Minuteman ICBM silos, and 2 SSBNs in long-term overhaul at any one time. This totaled 148 non-deployed launchers. Kuznetsov retorted that the U.S. proposal of 150 was unacceptable. He stated that in his personal view, taking into account political and technical issues, no limit on non-deployed ICBMs and SLBMs could be agreed.

¶11. (S) Kuznetsov recommended sending "non-deployed SLBM" to the Conforming Group. Siemon replied that his instructions were to not drop the "considered to contain" portion currently bracketed. As a result, he agreed to send the Qm to conforming with the U.S. text in brackets.

¶12. (U) Documents provided:

- UNITED STATES:

-- Official translation of "Open Skies Aircraft," in English.

¶13. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Siemon  
Lt Col Comeau  
Mr. Connell  
Mr. Coussa  
Mr. Dean  
Ms. Dreicer  
Mr. Sims

Dr. Hopkins (Int)

RUSSIA

Adm (Ret) Kuznetsov

Ms. Fuzhenkova

Col Kamenskiy

Mr. Luchaninov

Ms. Melikbekian

Mr. Pogodin (Int)

¶14. (U) Gottemoeller sends.  
GRIFFITHS